UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,871	11/06/2001	Amy L. Sherwood	BS01-176	4479

28970 7590 05/04/2005		

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 February 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _06-March-2002_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 22-February-2005, the specification of the disclosure
    and claim 14 have been amended by the applicant to overcome the objections raised by the
    examiner in the previous Office Action. Claims 1-31 are presently pending in the
    application, of which claims 1, 13, 19, 21 and 25 are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness
    rejections set forth in this Office action:

    > (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
    > section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
    > such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
    > having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
    > manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 9-26 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

    Andrews et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of Hickman et al (U.S.

    Patent No. 6,609,090.)

    As to claim 1, Andrews et al teaches a method for maintaining a personnel directory (see

    Abstract, and see paragraphs 79 and 155) comprising the steps of:

    receiving a request to edit an existing data entry of the personnel directory, wherein the

    existing data entry is stored in a current database location (see paragraphs 40 and 51-54);

responsive to receiving the request to edit the existing data entry (see page 47, claim 9);

editing the existing data entry of the personnel directory stored in the current database

location (see paragraphs 51-54) to produce an associated data entry (see paragraphs 121-

122); and

Andrews et al does not teach:

copying the existing data entry from the existing database location to create a previous

data entry in a historical database location; and

associating the previous data entry stored in the historical database location with the

associated data entry.

Hickman et al teaches a system of managing distributed assets (see Abstract), in which he

teaches:

copying the existing data entry from the existing database location to create a previous

data entry in a historical database location (see column 5, lines 55-56, see column 7, lines 18-

20, and see column 14, lines 23-34, where "existing database" is read on "master database

1");

editing the existing data entry in the current database location (see column 5, lines 56-60,

where "current database" is read on "master database 1", see column 7, lines 20-22, and see

column 14, lines 25-26);

associating the previous data entry stored in the historical database location with the

associated data entry (see column 11, lines 23-39.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include copying the existing

data entry from the existing database location to create a previous data entry in a historical

database location; editing the existing data entry in the current database location; and

associating the previous data entry stored in the historical database location with the

associated data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teachings of Hickman et al,

because including copying the existing data entry from the existing database location to

create a previous data entry in a historical database location; editing the existing data entry in

the current database location; and associating the previous data entry stored in the historical

database location with the associated data entry, would enable the system to save an un-

edited version of the current data in the backup/historical database before modifying the data

in the main database in order to maintain accurate historical data on the data elements. As

taught by Hickman et al, "Prior to updating the master database 1, the TAMIS application

software archives the most recent version of the master database 1 into a historical database

4" (see column 5, lines 49-51.)

As to claims 2, 14, 24 and 31, Andrews et al as modified, teaches wherein historical

database location and the current database location are in separate databases (see Hickman et

al, figure 1.)

As to claim 3, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the step of editing comprises changing the existing data entry to a new data entry, and wherein the associated data entry includes the new data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph 119.)

As to claim 4, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the existing data entry includes a name of a person listed in the personnel directory, and wherein the new data entry includes a new name of the person (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figures 4 and 50, and see paragraphs 86 and 148-150.)

As to claim 5, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the step of editing the existing data entry comprises deleting the existing data entry, and wherein the associated data entry includes a replacement data entry of the personnel directory (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, page 47, claim 6.)

As to claims 6, 18 and 30, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the step of prompting a user to identify the replacement data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figure 12, and see paragraphs 21 and 85.)

As to claim 9, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the steps of: receiving a search query looking for the previous data entry; searching the current database for the previous data entry; searching the historical database for the previous data entry; identifying the associated data entry as corresponding to the previous data entry; and

reporting the previous data entry and the associated data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figure 34

and see paragraphs 70, 102, 107 and 127.)

As to claims 10, 22, and 26, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the

step of reporting how the previous data entry and the associated data entry are associated (see

<u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraphs 102 and 127, where the "activity report" shows "the columns for

each reporting interval [either daily, weekly or monthly] that shows the number of contacts

that were in that deal status during that time period [information that should be stored in the

deal status history]".)

As to claim 11, <u>Andres et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the step of reporting

why the previous data entry was superseded (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraphs 102 and 127,

where the "activity report" can show the new sales statistics superseding the previous week's

sales statistics.)

As to claim 12, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the step of receiving a search

query comprises at least one of receiving the search query in a search engine of the personnel

directory (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph 125) and receiving the search query as a request to

browse a list of data entries from at least one of the current database and the historical

database (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph 127, where the "activity report" contains data from

current week's activities and previous weeks' activities.)

As to claim 13, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1-6 above.

As to claim 15, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the personnel directory application is adapted to search the current database location for the copied data entry, to search the historical database location for the copied data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph 127, where the "current activities" are obtained from current database and the previous activities are obtained from the "deal status history".)

As to claim 16, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches wherein the personnel directory application is adapted to provide an explanation of the association between the copied data entry and the edited data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph 127, where the "association" is read on the number of contacts on "that deal status" during that time period, indicating that the contacts within the reported time period are "associated" with the same "deal status".)

As to claim 17, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches, wherein the personnel directory application is adapted to copy a data entry of the current database location into the historical database location (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, paragraph102, and see <u>Hickman et al</u>, column 5, lines 55-56, see column 7, lines 18-20, and see column 14, lines 23-34, where "existing database" is read on "master database 1"), to delete the data entry of the current database location, and to associate the copied data entry of the historical database location with a replacement data

entry of the current database location (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, page 47, claim 6, and see <u>Hickman</u>
<u>et al</u>, column 11, lines 23-39.)

As to claim 19, <u>Andrews et al</u> teaches a personnel directory application (see Abstract, and
see paragraphs 79 and 155) comprising:

(a) a first database interface through which the personnel directory application is adapted
to store current data entries in a current database (see paragraphs 27-30);

(b) a second database interface through which the personnel directory application is
adapted to store outdated data entries in a historical database (see paragraph 31);

(c) a graphical user interface (see paragraph 77) that accepts a search query for a desired
outdated data entry (see paragraph 109.)

For the teachings of the actual "first database containing current data" and "second
database containing outdated data entries", the applicant is directed to the remarks and
discussions made in claim 1 above, with reference to <u>Hickman et al</u>, figure 1 and column 5,
lines 55-56, see column 7, lines 18-20, and see column 14, lines 23-34, where "existing
database" is read on "master database 1".

For the remaining steps of this claim, the applicant is directed to the remarks and
discussions made in claims 1-6 and 9-12 above.)

As to claim 20, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches wherein the current database and the
historical database are a single database (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figure 1, database 20.)

As to claims 21 and 25, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in

claims 1, 9, 13 and 19 above.

As to claim 23, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches wherein the existing data entry

includes a name of a member in the organization, and wherein the step of editing comprises

changing the name of the member (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figures 4 and 50, and see paragraphs

86 and 148-150.)

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Andrews et al</u> (U.S.

Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of <u>Hickman et al</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,090), as

applied to claims 1-6, 9-26 and 30-31 above, and further in view of <u>Seestrom et al</u> (U.S.

Publication No. 2002/0147731 Al.)

As to claim 7, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, still does not teach further comprising the step

of identifying the replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules.

<u>Seestrom et al</u> teaches a method of updating an addressee database in a mail sorting

apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches further comprising the step of identifying the

replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules (see paragraph 27, where

"predefined rules" is read on "signal is an "N" indicating a name change" and "replacement

data" is read on "new name".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, to include the step

of identifying the replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, by the teaching of <u>Seestrom</u>

<u>et al</u>, because by including the step of using the "N" signal indicating a name change, would

allow the application to make the appropriate modification to the employee's record in the

database.

5. Claims 8 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Andrews</u>

<u>et al</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of <u>Hickman et al</u> (U.S. Patent No.

6,609,090), as applied to claims 1-6, 9-26 and 30-31 above, and further in view of <u>Okura</u>

(U.S. Patent No. 5,829,003.)

As to claims 8 and 27, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, still does not teach wherein the

existing data entry corresponds to a departed person, and wherein the replacement data entry

corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person.

<u>Okura</u> teaches a record processing apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein

the existing data entry corresponds to a departed person and wherein the replacement data

envy corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person (see

Fig. 3A and 3B and see column 10, lines 36-41, where "departed person" is read on "Kyoko

Yamamoto" and "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, to include the existing data entry corresponds to a departed person, and wherein the replacement data entry corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, by the teaching of <u>Okura</u> because by including the existing data entry corresponds to a departed person, and wherein the replacement data entry corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person, would identified a new service superior in the organizational chart.

As to claim 28, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

<u>Okura</u> teaches wherein the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing member from the existing data entry (see Fig. 3A and 3B; see column 9, lines 44-47, where "organizational position" is read on "superior member", "departing member" is read on "Kyoko Yamamoto"), locating; a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry (see column 10, lines 36-41, where "organizational position" is read on "service superior" and "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, to include the

step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing

member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry with the

organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data

entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, by the teaching of Okura

because by including the step of determining comprises determining an organizational

position of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data

entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the

replacement data entry, would allow the re-assignment of the departing member's

organizational position to the appropriate personnel in the organization.

As to claim 29, Andrews et al as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of

determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing

data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making

the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

Okura teaches, wherein the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the

departing member from the existing data entry, (see Fig. 3A and 3B, see column 9, lines 38-

41, where "supervisor" is read on "service superior", "departing member" is read on "Kyoko

Yamamoto", and "existing data entry" is read on "employee record 54r-4"), locating a second

existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry (see column 10, lines 36-41, where "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, by the teaching of <u>Okura</u> because by including the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry, would allow the supervisor of the departing member to assume the departing member's organizational position.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 22-February-2005 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to historical

events and historical databases in general:

Patent/Pub. No.	Issued to	Cited for teaching
US 2003/0083846 A1	Curtin et al.	• Copying data from active database to historical database prior to making changes/updates to the data in the active database (paragraph 82.) • Associating entry in historical database with data entry (paragraph 114.)

8. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (571) 272-4083.

tm

April 29, 2005

SAM RIMELL

PRIMARY EXAMINER